

Identification of pictures in this set

1. Shot taken of M. J. and Pat Thomas on Hudson Hope Road at "Bear Flats " about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile distant across the chasm and taken from another similar bend in the road farther up the peak. (Hudson Hope Road)
2. Picture No. 1 was taken at the very peak of the twin hills shown in No. 2; outline and telephone pole may be seen at the very peak.
3. Mrs. M.J.Thomas shown in the distance on same road seen in Nos. 1 and 2.
4. Postoffice, telegraph office and stop on "Bear Flats"--Hudson Hope Road.
5. Wild horse (white spot) on one of the big hills. Taken from table land on Peace River bottom---Hudson Hope Road.
6. The little log church at Hudson Hope.
7. Log school house and trading post at Hudson Hope.
8. Collection of log homes at Hudson Hope on Peace River.
9. Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Thomas and Pat Thomas in front of hotel at Hudson Hope.
10. Hotel at Hudson Hope.
11. Collection of log cabins in connection with hotel accommodations at Hudson Hope.
12. Shot taken up the bank (by Leo Bolster in No. 13) of J.E. Kasner at top of hill.
13. Shot taken down from No. 1 of Leo Bolster, with Peace River still far below.
14. Peace River view with old Fort St. John on point of inlet.
15. Moberly River bed where it enters Peace River (Gravel pit)
16. Looking up Moberly river bed with Peace River in foreground.
17. A beautiful nook in dried canyon.
18. Ferry across Peace River.
19. View of Alaskan highway, beyond No. 1 camp.
20. Winter view of Alaskan highway.
21. Main street of Fort St. John, looking west.
22. Farther northward on the Alaskan highway.
23. The Alaskan highway across Simanni River.
24. Following a trap line at Fort Nelson.
25. A shot off the road into the woods; at random.
26. Stepping off the road into the woods with a random shot.
27. North Pine where we witnessed the holding of a "Stampede" (Rodeo and what not, put on by the natives and Indians.)

RESEARCH REPORT ON THE

1. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the treatment on the response of the subjects. The subjects were divided into two groups, one receiving the treatment and the other receiving a placebo. The results of the study are presented in the following table.

2. The first group, which received the treatment, showed a significant improvement in the response compared to the second group, which received the placebo. This improvement was observed in all three measures of response.

3. The second group, which received the placebo, showed no significant improvement in the response compared to the first group. This suggests that the treatment had a positive effect on the response.

4. The results of this study indicate that the treatment is effective in improving the response of the subjects. This finding has important implications for the use of the treatment in clinical practice.

5. The study was limited by the small number of subjects and the short duration of the treatment. Further research is needed to confirm these findings and to determine the long-term effects of the treatment.

6. The study was conducted in a controlled environment, which may have influenced the results. Future studies should be conducted in a more natural setting to determine the effectiveness of the treatment in real-world conditions.

7. The study was funded by the National Institutes of Health, which provided the resources necessary for the study to be conducted.

8. The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the National Commission on the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.

9. The study was published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, which is a leading journal in the field of medicine.

10. The study was presented at the annual meeting of the American Medical Association, where it was well-received by the attendees.